



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/789,308	02/26/2004	Thomas Jessel	070050,2891	8009
21003 7590 01/16/2008 BAKER BOTTS L.L.P. 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA 44TH FLOOR NEW YORK, NY 10112-4498				
EXAMINER GAMETT, DANIEL C				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1647				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/16/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DL.NYDOCKET@BAKERBOTTS.COM

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/789,308

Applicant(s)

JESSEL ET AL.

Examiner

DANIEL C. GAMETT

Art Unit

1647

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 November 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 81-87 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 81-87 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/14/2007.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendments of 11/14/2007 have been entered in full. Claims 1-80 are cancelled. Claims 81-87 are under examination.
2. The objections/rejections of record are moot, as Applicant has submitted an entirely new set of claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 81-87 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The preambles of claims 81 and 85 are incongruent with the recited steps and conclusions. The recited method steps are directed to identifying a “modulator of Hh-dependent neural differentiation”, as recited in the conclusion of claim 81, an agonist of motor neuron differentiation, as recited in the conclusion of claim 85. The preambles of claims 81 and 85 recite a method for identifying a *Hh-dependent modulator* of motor neuron differentiation (emphasis added). The straightforward meaning of expression *Hh-dependent modulator* would be, “an agent that depends on Hh for its ability to modulate differentiation.” This is not the same as “modulator of Hh-dependent neural differentiation”. The function of Hh in the recited method is to stimulate differentiation, not to facilitate the action of a modulator. The modulator identified by the recited method would be a modulator of Hh-

dependent neural differentiation; it might be a general modulator of motor neuron differentiation, but it would not necessarily depend on Hh for its activity. To show such dependence, the method would need to provide for a comparison of modulator activity in the presence and absence of Hh.

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 81-87 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Independent claims 81 and 85 fail to comply with the written description requirement for two reasons. First, this is a new matter rejection, as it recites “a factor that directly effects signaling within a Hh signalling pathway”. The specification provides a non-limiting exemplary list for the term “activator of an Hh signaling pathway” which includes, along with known Hh proteins, molecules which are not known to be directly involved with Hh signaling and for which any association with Hh signaling stems from common usage of intracellular pathways ([0165-1666] in the published application). The specification does not delineate a boundary between “direct” and “indirect” activation of Hh signaling, nor does it expressly contemplate any methods that are limited to direct effects. The introduction of claim changes which involve narrowing the claims by introducing

elements or limitations which are not supported by the as-filed disclosure is a violation of the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. See, e.g., *Fujikawa v. Wattanasin*, 93 F.3d 1559, 1571, 39 USPQ2d 1895, 1905 (Fed. Cir.1996) (a “laundry list” disclosure of every possible moiety does not constitute a written description of every species in a genus because it would not “reasonably lead” those skilled in the art to any particular species).

7. Secondly, the fact that a patent is directed to method entailing use of a compound, rather than to the compound *per se*, does not remove patentee's obligation to provide description of the compound sufficient to distinguish infringing methods from noninfringing methods (*University of Rochester v. G.D. Searle & Co.*, 69 USPQ2d 1886 (CAFC 2004)). In this case, the claims are drawn to methods that comprise administration of a genus of compounds recited as “a factor that directly effects signaling within a Hh signalling pathway”. To provide evidence of possession of a claimed genus, the specification must provide sufficient distinguishing identifying characteristics of the genus. The factors to be considered include disclosure of complete or partial structure, physical and/or chemical properties, functional characteristics, structure/function correlation, methods of making the claimed product, or any combination thereof. In this case, “a factor that directly effects signaling within a Hh signalling pathway” appears to delineate a smaller genus than had been recited in rejected and cancelled claim 66, for example. Nevertheless, this recitation still provides only a function without any structural limitation. Therefore, the reasons of record in the prior rejections of claims 66, 77, and 78 apply to the instant claims. It is suggested that Applicants simply recite “(c) activating a Hh signaling pathway”.

Conclusion

8. No claims are allowed.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel C. Gamett, PhD., whose telephone number is (571)272-1853. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Manjunath N. Rao can be reached on 571 272 0939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 1647

If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DCG

Art Unit 1647

14 January 2008

/David S Romeo/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1647